



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/754,326	01/05/2001	Tong S. Chen	EM/CHEN/6392	3662

7590 05/06/2004
BACON & THOMAS
625 Slaters Lane - 4th Floor
Alexandria, VA 22314-1176

EXAMINER

MAURO JR, THOMAS J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

2

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/754,326	Applicant(s) CHEN ET AL.	
Examiner Thomas J. Mauro Jr.	Art Unit 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 January 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 are pending and are presented for examination. A formal action on the merits of claims 1-19 follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-11, 14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conner et al. (U.S. 6,718,515) in view of Garrison (U.S. 6,336,114).

Regarding claim 1, Conner teaches the invention substantially as claimed, a method for dynamically generating tables for web pages, said method comprising the steps of:

analyzing a form head of a web page for accessing object information of a data binding object that is used to transfer information between said web page and a computer browser [Conner -- Figure 2, Col. 4 lines 59-67 – Col. 5 lines 1-25 and lines 38-50 and Col. 6 lines 23-54 – Webpage is required to be analyzed by browser in order to process and display information. Upon analyzing tags and code, object information, i.e. JSP code, of the table is processed which allows the dynamic generation of a webpage table to occur by invoking the proper methods, i.e. rawDataGetter, etc, to generate, populate and format the table];

Art Unit: 2143

obtaining a text attribute of a table object included in said web page [**Conner -- Col. 5 lines 63-67 – Formatter assigns attributes to cell data, i.e. font attribute**]; and

displaying said table object in said web page by using said text attribute [**Conner -- Col. 5 lines 7-10 and Col. 6 lines 4-19 – Web content is returned to the client, i.e. displayed. This display includes the customized web content, i.e. dynamic table, which includes the text attribute formatting, i.e. font, as described above**].

Conner fails to explicitly teach a user priority.

Garrison, however, discloses a method for restricting access to certain data tables within a database to users who do not have the privilege or access, i.e. user priority, to view the information [**Garrison -- Col. 5 lines 55-67 – Col. 7 lines 1-14**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the restricting of data access by privilege, i.e. user priority, as taught by Garrison into the invention of Conner, in order to keep information private and accessible only to authorized users with a given privilege or access level [**Garrison -- Col. 1 lines 13-20**].

Regarding claim 2, Conner-Garrison teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including wherein said data binding object is embedded in said web page for transferring information [**Conner -- Figure 2 and Col. 4 lines 59-67 – Col. 5 lines 1-10 – Webpage, after being requested by browser, is parsed and processed. This processing of code, which is embedded in the webpage, allows access to the object, i.e. JSP code and servlet, to generate the dynamic table**].

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 3, Conner-Garrison teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 2 above, including wherein said data binding object is a data source object [**Conner -- Col. 5 lines 38-44 – Data source object is the table**] derived from a dynamic hypertext markup language (DHTML) [**Conner -- Col. 4 lines 59-67 – Col. 5 lines 1-10 and Col. 7 lines 56-58 – Dynamic HTML (DHTML) is achieved through using java as a scripting language, i.e. JavaScript**].

Regarding claim 5, Conner-Garrison teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, wherein said text attribute comprises text contents [**Conner -- Col. 5 lines 54-58 – Text attribute and contents are the cell data used to populate the table**] and a font attribute [**Conner -- Col. 5 lines 58-67 – Font attribute allows fonts of table data and headings to be specified**].

Regarding claims 7, 9-10 and 11, these are system claims corresponding to the method claimed in claims 1, 2-3 and 5 above respectively. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 7, 9-10 and 11 are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 14, Conner teaches the invention substantially as claimed, a computer-readable storage medium for storing computer executable instructions for performing the dynamic table generation [**Conner -- Col. 4 lines 23-40**]. The remaining limitations of the claim are similar to the limitations of the method claimed in claim 1. Therefore, claim 14 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claims 16-17 and 18, these are computer-readable medium claims corresponding to the method claimed in claims 2-3 and 5 respectively. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 16-17 and 18 and rejected under the same rationale.

4. Claims 4, 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conner et al. (U.S. 6,718,515) and Garrison (U.S. 6,336,114), as applied to claims 1, 7 and 14 above respectively, in view of Bowman-Amuah (U.S. 6,615,253).

Regarding claim 4, Conner-Garrison teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, wherein said analyzing step comprises the steps of:

obtaining a parameter title from said data binding object and a parameter value for said parameter title [Conner -- Col. 5 lines 58-67, Col. 8 lines 50 and Col. 9 lines 34-36 – **Parameter title obtained is the name of the attribute associated with the object, i.e. ‘font color’ or ‘font size’, and the parameter value is the value associated with the title or attribute, i.e. ‘3’ or ‘red’**]; and

generating object information by using said parameter title, and said parameter value [Conner -- Col. 5 lines 51-67 – **Table information is generated by invoking a method to get the data for populating the cells along with using the parameter values for formatting the generated table**].

Art Unit: 2143

Conner-Garrison, while implied, fails to explicitly disclose the obtaining of an object and class identification.

Bowman-Amuah, however, discloses obtaining a Class_ID as a first attribute [**Bowman-Amuah -- Col. 279 lines 27-33**] along with an object ID [**Bowman-Amuah -- Col. 192 lines 1-16**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of class and object ID's as taught by Bowman-Amuah into the invention of Conner-Garrison, in order to provide table optimizations for faster loading and accessing [**Bowman-Amuah -- Col. 192 lines 8-16**].

Regarding claim 8, this is a system claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim 4. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 8 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 15, this is a computer-readable medium claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim 4. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 15 is rejected under the same rationale.

5. Claims 6, 12-13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conner et al. (U.S. 6,718,515) and Garrison (U.S. 6,336,114), as applied to claims 1, 7, 12 and 14 above respectively, in view of Roberts et al. (U.S. 6,560,633).

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 6, Conner-Garrison teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including:

displaying selected table objects in said web page by using said text attribute [**Conner -- Col. 5 lines 7-10 and Col. 6 lines 4-19 – Web content is returned to the client, i.e. displayed. This display includes the customized web content, i.e. dynamic table, which includes the text attribute formatting, i.e. font, as described above**] and said user priority [**Garrison -- Col. 5 lines 55-67 – Col. 7 lines 1-14**].

Conner-Garrison fail to explicitly teach inputting a selection command to indicate selection status of a table object.

Roberts, however, discloses a method for creating network services which provides a dynamic webpage allowing users to interact with webpage tables in order to select and sort a column or to select a row to view more detailed information [**Roberts -- Col. 13 lines 49-67**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the interactive webpage tables, i.e. sorting and viewing detailed information of a selected row or column, as taught by Roberts into the invention of Conner-Garrison, in order to provide users/clients with a variety of capabilities to efficiently customize applications, i.e. web pages, at runtime [**Roberts -- Col. 2 lines 22-32**].

Regarding claim 12, Conner-Garrison teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 7 above, but fails to explicitly teach table style generating responsive to selection command for varying the status of table objects.

Art Unit: 2143

Roberts, however, discloses a method for creating network services which provides a dynamic webpage allowing users to interact with webpage tables in order to select and sort a column or to select a row to view more detailed information [**Roberts -- Col. 13 lines 49-67**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the interactive webpage tables, i.e. sorting and viewing detailed information of a selected row or column, as taught by Roberts into the invention of Conner-Garrison, in order to provide users/clients with a variety of capabilities to efficiently customize applications, i.e. web pages, at runtime [**Roberts -- Col. 2 lines 22-32**].

Regarding claim 13, Conner-Garrison-Roberts teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 12 above, wherein said selection command is used for designating the selection status of said table object [**Roberts -- Col. 13 lines 54-56 and Col. 15 lines 1-3 – User selects table object, i.e. column, by clicking mouse in order to sort the contents**].

Regarding claim 19, this is a computer-readable medium claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim 6. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 19 is rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2143

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Rheume (U.S. 6,247,018) discloses a method for automatically processing a file to generate a table or database.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Mauro Jr. whose telephone number is 703-605-1234. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00a.m. - 4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



TJM
April 27, 2004



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100